REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-22, and 24-27 are pending in this application. No amendments are made by this Response. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-22, and 24-27

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-22, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322 B1) in view of Low et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,996,605 B2) further in view of Hinton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,596 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wood is directed to a security architecture that uses a single sign-on. In Wood, session credentials are used to maintain continuity of a persistent session across multiple accesses to one or more information resources, and in some embodiments, across credential level changes. Session credentials are secured, e.g., as a cryptographically secured session token, such that they may be inspected by a wide variety of entities or applications to verify an authenticated trust level, yet may not be prepared or altered except by a trusted authentication service.

Low is directed to a service system associated with a web site that establishes a respective communication session for selected web pages and joins to the session any party currently viewing the page. In Low, a sessions overview subsystem is notified of parties joining and leaving sessions and maintains a real-time database of current page sessions and the parties currently joined to each session. A user interface of the overview subsystem dynamically generates a session overview page from the real-time database and serves this page to a requesting permitted user, such as a customer service representative in a contact center associated with the service system. The permitted user can then select a specific session and request to be joined to it.

The Final Office Action admits that Wood does not teach **selecting** a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user **based on the determined security domain** (see Final Office Action, page 3, last paragraph). While Low may teach that a user can

select a particular session from the session's overview and join this session, neither Wood nor Low, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest **selecting** a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user **based on the determined security domain**. The Final Office Action admits that Low does not teach this feature but alleges that Hinton teaches this feature (see Final Office Action, page 4, second paragraph).

The Hinton patent and the instant application were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) states:

> (c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

The instant application was filed on or after November 29, 1999 and has a foreign priority date of June 17, 2003. The Hinton patent was published on June 19, 2003. The Hinton publication qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, the Hinton publication cannot be used in a 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection to preclude patentability. As such, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wood and Low, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest **selecting** a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user **based on the determined security domain** as recited in independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Moreover, Hinton cannot be used as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. At least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the features of dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24-27 are not taught by Wood, Low, and Hinton, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-22, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: December 18, 2007

Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Walder Intellectual Property Law, P.C.
P.O. Box 832745
Richardson, TX 75083
(214) 722-6491
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS